



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/816,324

03/26/2001

Tomoaki Ikeda

1190-0490P

8566

2292

7590

05/21/2004

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

JOHNSON, TIMOTHY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/816,324

Applicant(s)

IKEDA ET AL.

Examiner

Timothy M Johnson

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 10-13 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 9 and 14-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5 & 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Drawings

1. The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed April 14, 2004 have been approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Normile, 6,028,965.

For claim 21, an image encoding method comprising receiving an image signal and dividing the image signal into macroblocks to generate block-divided image signals is provided by Normile in at least c. 3, lines 18-60. Encoding the block-divided image signals and outputting encoded image signals to a transmission path is provided by Normile in at least the second full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 3-4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the second full paragraph in c. 7. Limiting the number of bits per pixel of the image signal to be encoded by the image encoding circuit according to a bit rate of the transmission path is provided by Normile in at least c. 2, lines 5-51, the second full paragraph in c. 4, the last full paragraph in c. 4, the second full paragraph in c. 5, the paragraph bridging cols. 5-6, the fourth full paragraph in c. 6, the last full paragraph in c. 6, the first full paragraph in c. 7, the second full paragraph in

Art Unit: 2625

c. 7, the paragraph bridging cols. 7-8, and the first two full paragraphs in c. 8, with numerous explicitly recitations for reducing the amount of bits or bitrate, which is selected in numerous ways where cited above by Normile, and since the amount of image data is reduced by Normile, the number of bits per pixel, i.e. BPP, of the image is limited

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-2, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normile, 6,028,965, in view of Okada, 5,729,295.

For claim 1, an image encoding device comprising an image signal input circuit receiving an image signal and dividing the image signal into macroblocks to generate block-divided image signals is provided by Normile in at least c. 3, lines 18-60. An image encoding circuit encoding the block-divided image signals output from the image signal input circuit, and outputting encoded image signals to a transmission path is provided by Normile in at least the second full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 3-4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the second full paragraph in c. 7. An

Art Unit: 2625

encoded region designator designating regions to be encoded by the image encoding circuit in accordance with a bitrate of the transmission path, wherein the image encoding circuit encodes only those regions designated by the encoded region designator may be provided by Normile in a broad sense, since Normile provides for causing certain portions of the image to be coded or not coded or coded differently based on the transmission bitrate in at least c. 2, lines 5-51, the second full paragraph in c. 4, the last full paragraph in c. 4, the second full paragraph in c. 5, the paragraph bridging cols. 5-6, the fourth full paragraph in c. 6, the last full paragraph in c. 6, the first full paragraph in c. 7, the second full paragraph in c. 7, the paragraph bridging cols. 7-8, and the first two full paragraphs in c. 8, so that region designation can be considered to be provided. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider regions being designated by Normile, since Normile provides for selectively reducing part of the image, filtering some parts of the image, truncating some parts of the transformed image, and sets some motion vectors to zero, where motion vectors correspond to specific regional blocks of the image. In any case, for further evidence of the conventionality of region selection, Okada explicitly provides for region selection of an area for enhanced quality compression of some selected regions of the image in at least c. 14, line 20 – c. 15, line 1. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use region selection with Normile as taught by Okada, since Okada provides for at least the advantages of preventing noise and increasing allocation of codes to a specified area and motion area in c. 14, lines 20-28.

For claim 2, the image encoding device as set forth in claim 1, wherein said encoded region designator receives the bit rate of the transmission path is provided by Normile where cited above, and further by Okada in at least c. 14, lines 29-42, and a motion vector detected by said image encoding circuit is suggested by Normile where the motion vectors belong to specific block regions, and more so by Okada in at least c. 14, line 20 – c. 15, line 1, and designates the encoded regions based on them is provided by Normile and Okada where just cited.

For claim 14, see the rejection of at least claim 1.

For claim 15, see the rejection of at least claim 1. The image encoder as set forth in claim 14, wherein the encoded region designator receives the bitrate of the transmission path and at least one of a motion vector detected by the image encoding circuit, and region information, the encoded region designator designating the encoded regions based on the bitrate and at least one of the motion vector and region information is provided by Normile who clearly provides for encoding region blocks based on bitrate, and Okada provides for designating regions based on encoding rate using a specified region and motion vectors where cited above.

For claim 16, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

For claim 18, see the rejection of at least claim 1.

Art Unit: 2625

For claim 19, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

For claim 20, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

6. Claims 1, 3, 14-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normile, 6,028,965, in view of in view of Dunn et al., 6,356,664.

For claim 1, an image encoding device comprising an image signal input circuit receiving an image signal and dividing the image signal into macroblocks to generate block-divided image signals is provided by Normile in at least c. 3, lines 18-60. An image encoding circuit encoding the block-divided image signals output from the image signal input circuit, and outputting encoded image signals to a transmission path is provided by Normile in at least the second full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 3-4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the second full paragraph in c. 7. An encoded region designator designating regions to be encoded by the image encoding circuit in accordance with a bitrate of the transmission path, wherein the image encoding circuit encodes only those regions designated by the encoded region designator may be provided by Normile in a broad sense, since Normile provides for causing certain portions of the image to be coded or not coded or coded differently based on the transmission bitrate in at least c. 2, lines 5-51, the second full paragraph in c. 4, the last full paragraph in c. 4, the second full paragraph in c. 5, the paragraph bridging cols. 5-6, the fourth full paragraph in c. 6, the last full paragraph in c. 6, the first full paragraph in c. 7, the second full paragraph in c. 7, the paragraph bridging cols. 7-8, and the first two full paragraphs in c. 8, so that region designation can be considered to

Art Unit: 2625

be provided. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to consider regions being designated by Normile, since Normile provides for selectively reducing part of the image, filtering some parts of the image, truncating some parts of the transformed image, and sets some motion vectors to zero, where motion vectors correspond to specific regional blocks of the image. In any case, for further evidence of the conventionality of region selection, Dunn provides for region selection of an area for enhanced quality by differently compressing in accordance with the selection. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use region selection with Normile as taught by Dunn, since Dunn provides for at least the advantages of both efficiency in that most of the bandwidth is assigned to the important areas of the video, and thus simultaneously providing for a substantial increase in compression.

For claim 3, the image encoding device as set forth in claim 1, wherein said encoded region designator receives the bit rate of the transmission path is provided by Normile where cited above, and in conjunction with region designation of Dunn, and region information is provided by Dunn in at least the first full paragraph in c. 7, and designates the encoded regions based on them is provided by Normile and Dunn where just cited.

For claim 14, see the rejection of at least claim 1.

For claim 15, see the rejection of at least claim 1. The image encoder as set forth in claim 14, wherein the encoded region designator receives the bitrate of the transmission path and at least one of a motion vector detected by the image encoding circuit, and region information, the encoded region designator designating the encoded regions based on the bitrate and at least one of the motion vector and region information is provided by Normile who clearly provides for encoding region blocks based on bitrate, and Dunn provides for designating regions based on encoding rate for a specified region are where cited above and at least the abstract of Dunn, and Dunn also provides for the frame rate being dependent on motion as well in at least the last full paragraph in c. 4, where objects with different motion can be discerned, where objects with different motion at least inherently have different motion vectors.

For claim 16, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

For claim 18, see the rejection of at least claim 1.

For claim 19, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

For claim 20, see the rejection of at least claim 15.

7. Claims 4 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normile, 6,028,965, in view of in view of Stanger et al., 6,097,435.

For claim 4, an image encoding device comprising an image signal input circuit receiving an image signal and dividing the image signal into macroblocks to generate block-divided image signals is provided by Normile in at least c. 3, lines 18-60. An

Art Unit: 2625

image encoding circuit encoding the block-divided image signals output from the image signal input circuit, and outputting encoded image signals to a transmission path is provided by Normile in at least the second full paragraph in c. 4, the paragraph bridging cols. 3-4, the paragraph bridging cols. 4-5, and the second full paragraph in c. 7. A selector limiting the number of bits of the image signal to be encoded by the image encoding circuit according to a bit rate of the transmission path is provided by Normile in at least c. 2, lines 5-51, the second full paragraph in c. 4, the last full paragraph in c. 4, the second full paragraph in c. 5, the paragraph bridging cols. 5-6, the fourth full paragraph in c. 6, the last full paragraph in c. 6, the first full paragraph in c. 7, the second full paragraph in c. 7, the paragraph bridging cols. 7-8, and the first two full paragraphs in c. 8, with numerous explicit recitations for reducing the amount of bits or bitrate, which is selected in numerous ways where cited above by Normile. A bit selector limiting the number of bits per pixel (i.e. BPP), in light of Applicant's specification, is not explicitly provided by Normile, although the number of BPP is certainly controlled by Normile of the image signal to be coded, since the reduction of information to be coded taught by Normile removes bits from the image, which lowers the BPP as a function of bitrate as claimed, so that "bit selection" is considered provided by Normile. Bit selection can be considered provided by Normile, since if the BPP is limited before coding, then bit selection is provided by the reduction of the image before decoding, which reduces the BPP of the image. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to understand that Normile provides for bit selection, since given that Normile clearly provides for reducing the

Art Unit: 2625

amount of image data bits of the image, such image data bits cannot be reduced without "selection". In any case, Stanger clearly provides for selectively selecting the number of BPP as noted in at least the second full paragraph in c. 5. Normile can use the bit selection feature of Stanger in addition to or as the circuits for reducing the data to be coded, since Normile and Stanger are in the same field of image compression and are both motion based transform coding, so that the references are identical in many aspects and further including bitrate control. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the bit selection of Stanger, since limiting the number of bits per pixel is also based on bitrate control in at least the abstract of Stanger, and which is advantageous, since Stanger provides for variably doing so, and because the least significant bits, i.e. the least important bits are limited so as to preserve quality of the image signal.

For claim 17, see the rejection of at least claim 4. The bit selector of Normile is interposed between the image signal input and the coder, and similarly for Stanger, where the bit selector is prior to the coder.

8. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Normile, 6,028,965, and Stanger et al., 6,097,435, as applied to claims 4 and 17 above, and further in view of Christian et al., 5,668,352.

For claim 9, a selector receiving the block divided image signals and selecting the number of most significant bits per pixel from the block divided image signals is

Art Unit: 2625

provided by Stanger in at least the second full paragraph in c. 5 and Normile where cited above, where Normile teaches limiting the image BPP, wherein the number of most significant bits per pixel varies according to the bitrate of the transmission path is provided by both Stanger in at least the abstract and Normile where cited above. A bit number determining circuit receiving the bitrate of the transmission path and determining the number of most significant bits per pixel of the image signal according to the bitrate of the transmission path is suggested by at least Stanger, since some number of most significant bits is what Stanger provides as output. Stanger and Normile clearly provide for obtaining a variable number of most significant bits based on the bitrate, but are merely are silent for only explicitly determining a number of most significant bits. Determining a number of most significant bits is conventional and well known, and is provided by Christian in at least c. 8. lines 28-32, and also in c. 10, lines 32-44. Stanger and Normile can clearly use the counting of most significant bits as taught by Christian and can be used with the obtaining of the most significant bits as taught by Stanger and Normile to control the bitrate, and Stanger and Normile and Christian are all in the same field of image compression. It would've been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to count the number of most significant bits, since this would assist the circuits of Stanger and Normile for controlling which bits are retained and which are not.

Response to Amendment

9. The objections to the drawings and the 35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejections have been overcome by amendment. The title is now descriptive.

10. Applicant's arguments filed April 14, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues on pages 20-23 of the amendment the following:

1. That the pre-filter of Normile does not provide for a selector that limits the number of bits per pixel, i.e. BPP, of the image signal to be encoded.

2. That the pre-filter of Normile is not based on the bitrate of the transmission path.

3. That Normile does not provide for an encoded region designator causing certain portions of the image to be coded or not coded based on the transmission bitrate, indicating that the reduction controller of Normile does not designate a region, and if it does, that it is not dependent on the transmission bitrate, and that the pre-filtering of Normile does not designate regions either.

4. That Okada and Dunn do not provide for selecting or designating regions to be encoded according to the bitrate of the transmission path.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees:

1. The pre-filter undoubtedly reduces the BPP of the image, because Normile explicitly reduces the amount of encoded data in at least the first full paragraph in c. 5 by using the pre-filter. Thus, for example, if the BPP was x coming into the pre-filter, y

Art Unit: 2625

(where $y < x$) would be the output of the filter.

2. The pre-filter, among other components of Normile, is clearly based on the bitrate as taught by Normile in at least the last full paragraph in c. 4 and the four full paragraphs in c. 5. That, is, the pre-filtering is a function of the bitrate.

3. Similar to the pre-filter of Normile, the reduction controller of Normile also varies which regions are selected for encoding based on the bitrate. In the case of the reduction controller, some data regions cannot possibly be coded, since the data is not available to the coder. The data reduced by the reduction controller is only regenerated after coding by interpolation, which recovers the missing data. Additionally, Normile also provides for pre-filtering specific regions based on the transmission rate in most of col. 5, where Normile explicitly recites areas of an image, i.e. regions, and specifically excludes noise in the region, and also reduces data in the regions by filtering, so that certain region data is also not coded.

4. Applicant admits Okada provides for selecting and designating regions to be encoded. Not only does Normile provide for encoding based on bitrate, but so does Okada. As noted in the rejection, Okada specifies areas for encoding for an encoding rate. Similarly, the invention of Dunn provides for selecting designating areas of the image that will be sampled at a different rate.

Final

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

Art Unit: 2625

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 10-13 are allowed.

13. Claim 5-8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

For claim 10, the prior art of record, Normile, 6,028,965, Okada, 5,729,295, Dunn et al., 6,356,664, and Christian et al., 5,668,352, does not suggest, in combination with the claim as a whole, receiving an image signal and dividing the image signal into macroblocks, and encoding the block divided image signals, and outputting encoded

Art Unit: 2625

image signals to a transmission path, a first encoded region designator receiving a bitrate of the transmission path and a motion vector detected by the image encoding circuit, and designating a first encoded region based on the bitrate of the transmission path and the motion vector, and a second encoded region designator receiving the bitrate of the transmission path and region information, and designating a second encoded region based on the bitrate of the transmission path and the region information, wherein the image encoding circuit encodes only those regions designated by both the first and second encoded region designators. Normile provides for, inter alia, encoding only block regions based on bitrate, where the BPP are reduced by at least image reduction, filtering, discrete cosine transformation, and motion vector control. Okada provides for controlling the bitrate by at least specific region designation and motion maps, where specific areas can be also determined by motion vectors and also by block activity. Christian is used merely to provide for the conventionality of counting the number of most significant bits. Dunn provides for altering the frame rate based on specific regions of the image including regions that may have motion.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance".

Art Unit: 2625


Contact Information

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Timothy M Johnson whose telephone number is 703-306-3096. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 5:30 to 2:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bhavesh M. Mehta, can be reached on Monday – Friday from 9:30 to 5:00. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Timothy M. Johnson
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2625
May 20, 2004


TIMOTHY M. JOHNSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER